



Final Statement

Land at 40 Newland Road
Upper Beeding
West Sussex BN44 3JJ

On Behalf of

Mr Simon Stringer

LPA Reference DC/25/2072
Appeal reference 6013893

Prepared by
David Campion MRICS

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement represents the appellant's comments in relation to his appeal and comprises five sections:
- 1 Comments on the LPA's Statement and Response.
 - 2 Comments on the third party objections.
 - 3 Further comments following the subsequent revision to the NPPF.
 - 4 The National Planning Policy Framework.
 - 5 Summary and conclusion.

2 Comments on the LPA's Statement and Response

- 2.1 I note that the LPA's statement was written on 26 August 2026 which post dates the introduction of the revised NPPF (17 August 2026). I will address these revisions at my Section 4 but make the point here that while the LPA accepts that the dwelling "would contribute to the housing supply", "is located within a built-up area (a sustainable location)", and that "the principle of development is not contested", it is disappointing that the LPA did not place its comments in the context of the revised NPPF. Had it done so, its objections based on "design and siting" could have been set out in relation to current national planning policy.
- 2.2 I note also that the LPA recognises that the development is within the settlement boundary and not within a designated area worthy of special protection. It follows that Policy 25 is limited to consideration of the effect of the development on "settlement characteristics". The appellant does not agree that the proposal is so harmful to the varied, and not particularly distinctive, character of the settlement to outweigh the merits of the scheme.
- 2.3 On the question of impact on neighbouring amenity, the LPA refers to a document that was not cited in its reasons for refusal and which it admits is for guidance for home extensions and not new builds. In any event the guidance is only "normally" applied and is not mandatory. The appellant does not agree with the interpretation of this document and feels little weight should be placed upon it when considering the NPPF when taken as a whole.

- 2.4 The suggested conditions are agreeable if the Inspector feels they are essential to making the development acceptable in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance but I suggest that:
- a) Condition 2, Drainage, is unnecessary as details of drainage will be subject to Building Regulation consent.
 - b) Condition 4, Broadband. I do not feel this is a condition that is essential to make development acceptable. Installation of broadband, as with other communication systems such as telephone and television, is the prerogative of the occupier, not the developer.
 - c) Condition 8, Parking. The Design and Access Statement submitted with the planning application noted that "the site includes off street car parking utilising a new cross over that has already been permitted and is shown/noted on Application drawings". In its subsequent consultation response, the Highway Authority raised no objection to this arrangement.

3 Comments on the Third Party representations

3.1 The Parish Council:

- a) I have commented in the appellant's appeal statement on the Parish Council's single objection (parking) to the planning application by noting it cannot be substantiated as it is not the view of the Highway Authority.
- b) The Parish Council now introduces new reasons to object to this development based on it being an overdevelopment of the site, failure to respect the surrounding area, impact on neighbouring amenity and a form of garden or infill development. I have addressed these issues in my response to the LPA's case and response. I would however add that the reference to garden infilling ignores advice contained in the revised NPPF and the imperative to make optimum use of available land.

3.2 The Interested Party

- a) I note this objection comes from a redacted, anonymous source about whom nothing is known other than he/she is a neighbouring resident who did not comment on the original planning application during the determination stage. In these circumstances I am not sure that this representation carries significant weight.

- b) However, I take the opportunity to repeat my earlier submissions to counter these objections based on design, parking and impact on local character. I refer the Inspector again to the fact that these points (including the issue of garden development) should be considered in the light of revised policies within the NPPF 2026.

4 The National Planning Policy Framework

- 4.1 I dealt at length with the NPPF as it existed at the time of writing my appeal statement and suggest that the principles within the paragraphs noted in that statement are as relevant to this proposal and the 2026 NPPF as they are today.
- 4.2 The current NPPF endorses my previous observation that the Government intends to meet its housing target, notwithstanding that subsequent pronouncements have suggested this may be challenging.
- 4.3 The NPPF sets out ways of addressing those challenges by saying that the default principle is now a “presumption in favour” of development within settlements and endorsing a greater density of development to meet unmet housing needs. The LPA has accepted the principle of development on this site within the defined settlement boundary but not suggested any reason why the principles set out in the revised NPPF should not now be applied to this development.
- 4.4 Specifically, **Policy S4** says of the principle of development within settlements that:
1. Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.
 2. In applying policy S4, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would:
 - a. Have a substantial adverse impact in relation to:
 - i. The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or

ii. The application of the policies in this Framework for existing recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)).

b. Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for a cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or

c. Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

- 4.5 Notwithstanding the appellant's argument that the development has no adverse impacts on the criteria noted in S4, **Policy H07**: Meeting the need for homes requires substantial weight to be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the local community. The LPA does not dispute its shortfall in the supply of housing land.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 5.1 This final statement is to be read in conjunction with the submitted Appeal Statement and examines the LPA and third party comments. It sets out the reasons why the appellant believes his appeal should be allowed.
- 5.2 The appellant submits that these additional comments do not take account of the new NPPF which was not in force when the decision to refuse planning permission was taken and which adds even greater weight to the arguments advanced by the appellant to support this appeal.
- 5.3 The proposal would provide an additional home to meet an unmet housing need within a settlement boundary where the LPA has accepted the principle of development, and where the proposal will have no adverse effects having regard to the NPPF 2026 taken as a whole.